

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request continued examination of the application taking into account the amendment to the claims provided by this submission. No new matter is believed to be claimed, as the disclosure fully supports the inventive concept that both parts of the target are exposed to ion beam erosion and the surface area of the insert corresponds to the area eroded by the ion beam. Allowable claim 4 has been written in independent form.

Applicants submits that the claims as now amended are allowable, and early and favorable consideration of the application under continued examination therefore is respectfully requested. Applicants submit the invention set forth in the revised claims is patentable for the reasons that both target source parts are exposed to the ion beam but are configured such that the erosion is substantially confined to the insert. Whether taken alone or in combination, none of the cited prior art, including the cited references to Hunt et al (US 5,674,367), Nakamura et al (JP 61-067768), Fukushima et al (JP 63-143258) and Ivanov et al (US 5,522,535), nor any other prior art known to applicants, anticipate or make obvious the invention as now claimed with the above described features. For example with respect to Hunt, it is clear that part 12 is a mounting ring and is not part of the target, and moreover is not exposed to the vacuum chamber, which clearly is illustrated in Fig. 8 of Hunt. Nowhere is disclosed a two part target, the functional equivalent in Hunt being the one-piece target blanks 10 and 38 and not the entire mounting including the supporting ring 12.